

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Solely in order to expedite prosecution, the claims have been presented in a form that is believed to be preferred by the Examiner. Also, it is respectfully requested that claims 3 and 20 to be cancelled without disclaimer solely in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-12, 15 and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent No. 6,738,977 (*Berry et al.*) in view of the U.S. patent No. 6,339,841(*Merrick et al.*). This rejections is fully traversed below.

(a) *Merrick et al.* does not teach or suggest selecting information from a class file in a memory portion after the class file has been loaded in its entirety into the memory portion (see, for example, claim 1)

It is noted that *Merrick et al.* relates to a class loading model. However, *Merrick et al.* teaches performing a post compilation process on object code to generate component object code, namely, Meta data and methods. The post compilation process is applied in order to break down the self-contained structure of a classes and convert a self contained class into individually accessible components of the class (*Merrick et al.*, Col. 3, lines 36-45). As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Merrick et al.* does not teach selecting information from the class file. Instead, *Merrick et al.* teaches: first breaking down the object code into individually accessible components and then loading these individual components into the virtual machine (*Merrick et al.*, Col. 3, lines 36-43).

(b) *Merrick et al.* cannot be properly combined with *Berry et al.*

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the methodology of *Merrick* requires post compilation processing to generate Meta data and methods. In contrast, the claimed invention does not require any post compilation processing of the class file. Hence, the methodology of *Merrick et al.* is substantially different than the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that *Merrick et al.* cannot possibly be

combined with another reference to teach the claimed invention because its methodology is fundamentally different from the claimed invention.

(c) *The combination of the Merrick et al. and Berry et al. do NOT teach or suggest several other features (see, for example, claim 5 and 9)*

For example, claim 7 additionally recites loading an internal representation of the selected information that includes a method reference portion for the selected information, wherein the method reference portion includes one or more references cells which provide information associated with one or more methods which have been selected to be loaded into the virtual machine. It is noted that Fig. 2 of *Merrick et al.* illustrates a method table 26. However, it is respectfully submitted that the method table 26 of *Merrick et al.* does not teach or suggest a method reference portion that includes one or more references cells which provide information associated with one or more methods which have been selected to be loaded into the virtual machine.

In addition, *Merrick et al.* does not teach or suggest populating these cells (see, for example, claim 9).

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P815). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300